

FORMAL ENTRY

**CRAWFORD MAUNU PLLC**  
Attorneys at Law  
1270 Northland Drive, Suite 390  
St. Paul, Minnesota 55120  
651-686-6633 • fax 651-686-7111

---

**FACSIMILE**

<b>DATE:</b>	March 27, 2003	<b>SER. NO.:</b>	09/876,661
<b>ATTN:</b>	Examiner Artman	<b>FROM:</b>	Robert J. Crawford
<b>FAX NO.:</b> <b>PHONE NO.:</b>	(703) 872-9318	<b>DOCKET NO.</b>	US 010287
<b>NO. OF PAGES</b> <b>(w/ cover sheet):</b>	6	<b>SUBJECT:</b>	<u>OFFICE ACTION</u> <u>RESPONSE</u>

**NOTICE OF CONFIDENTIALITY AND**  
**ATTORNEY-CLIENT PRIVILEGED/WORK PRODUCT INFORMATION**

This memorandum and the transmission it accompanies contain confidential information. The attorney-client privilege and the attorney work-product doctrines may protect this confidential information. This confidential information is to be reviewed only by the addressee identified above. If you have received this transmission in error, you are instructed to destroy all pages immediately and to call the sender at the telephone number indicated above.

Response

#  
10

3-31-03

J. Artis

PATENT

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Applicant:	Marshall et al.	Examiner:	Artman, T.
Serial No.:	09/876,661	Group Art Unit:	2882
Filed:	June 7, 2001	Docket No.:	US 010287
Title:	LED LUMINAIRE WITH LIGHT SENSOR CONFIGURATIONS FOR OPTICAL FEEDBACK		

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence and the papers, as described hereinabove, are being transmitted via facsimile only-Formal Entry, to the attention of Examiner Artman Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C. 20231, on March 27, 2003.

Facsimile No. (703) 872-9318

By:

Kelly S. Walhney

OFFICE ACTION RESPONSE

Assistant Commissioner for Patents  
Washington, D.C. 20231

Dear Sir:

In response to the Office Action dated January 9, 2003, please consider the following remarks.

Remarks

Favorable reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the following remarks. For the reasons set forth below, Applicant respectfully submits that the claimed invention is allowable over the cited references.

The Office Action dated January 9, 2003, indicated that claims 8 and 10 stand rejected under §102(e) as being anticipated by *Miller et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,373,568); claim 9 stands rejected under §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Miller et al.* and in view of *Pashley et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,127,783); and claims 1-7 are allowed.

Applicant appreciates the allowance of claims 1-7.

Applicant respectfully traverses each of the prior art rejections.